

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1 - 15 are in the case. Claims 1, 8 and 11 have been amended. Claims 16 - 20 are canceled. The Specification has been amended to correct a minor informality.

Regarding the objection to Claim 8, the typographical error kindly pointed out by the Examiner has been corrected. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Okamoto et al., Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection. Claim 1 now recites a layer of a conductive material applied to the baseplate and arranged to around the chip, and *having a support surface facing away from the baseplate which is at least as high as the surface of the chip facing away from the baseplate, and the support surface of the layer serving as a support for the cover plate*. This clearly distinguishes from Okamoto et al. which uses resin for encapsulation rather than a cover plate, and so does not use a support for its encapsulation cover. The use of a cover plate in the claimed invention, in combination with the other recited features, allows for a simple and cost-effective process for its production. The other art of record is even less relevant. It is therefore respectfully submitted that for the above reasons Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Okamoto et al. nor, indeed, by any of the art of record whether considered individually or in any combination. Claim 6 depends from Claim 1 and so is allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 2 - 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Okamoto et al. in view of Nakaoka et al., Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection, with Claims 2 - 5 each depending, directly or indirectly from Claim 1. The reasons for the allowability of Claim 1 over Okamoto et al. are set forth above. Nakaoka et al. fails to cure the

deficiencies of Okamoto et al. Nakaoka et al. apparently relates to a three dimensional device, and was cited for the alleged teaching of a filler material. Like Okamoto et al., it neither teaches nor suggests a layer of a conductive material applied to a baseplate and arranged to around a chip, and having a support surface facing away from the baseplate which is at least as high as the surface of the chip facing away from the baseplate, and the support surface of the layer serving as a support for a cover plate. The other art of record is even less relevant. It is therefore respectfully submitted that for the above reasons Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Okamoto et al., nor by Nakaoka et al., nor, indeed, by any of the art of record whether considered individually or in any combination. Claims 2 - 5 depend from Claim 1 and so are allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Okamoto et al., Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection, with Claims 7 and 8 each depending, directly or indirectly from Claim 1. The reasons for the allowability of Claim 1 over Okamoto et al. are set forth above. The other art of record is even less relevant. It is therefore respectfully submitted that for the above reasons Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Okamoto et al. nor, indeed, by any of the art of record whether considered individually or in any combination. Claims 7 and 8 depend from Claim 1 and so are allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 9 - 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Okamoto et al. in view of Loeffler et al., Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to overcome this rejection, with Claims 9 and 10 each depending, directly or indirectly from Claim 1. The reasons for the allowability of Claim 1 over Okamoto et al. are set forth above. Claim 11 has

been amended similarly to Claim 1 and so the reasons set forth above for the allowability of Claim 1 over Okamoto et al. apply as well to Claim 11, and so for those reasons it is respectfully submitted that Claim 11 is allowable over Okamoto et al., as well. The patent to Loeffler et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Okamoto et al. Loeffler et al. apparently relates to an anti-theft system for a motor vehicle, and was cited for allegedly disclosing a chip that is a transponder. Like Okamoto et al., it neither teaches nor suggests a layer of a conductive material applied to a baseplate and arranged to around a chip, and having a support surface facing away from the baseplate which is at least as high as the surface of the chip facing away from the baseplate, and the support surface of the layer serving as a support for a cover plate. The other art of record is even less relevant. It is therefore respectfully submitted that for the above reasons Claims 1 and 11 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Okamoto et al., nor by Loeffler et al., nor, indeed, by any of the art of record whether considered individually or in any combination. Claims 9 and 10 depend from Claim 1 and so are allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 12 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Okamoto et al., Nakaoka et al. and in view of Loeffler et al., Claim 11 has been amended to overcome this rejection, with Claims 12 - 15 each depending, directly or indirectly from Claim 11. The reasons for the allowability of Claim 11 over Okamoto et al. and Loeffler et al. are set forth above. The reasons for the allowability of Claim 1 over Okamoto et al. and Nakaoka et al. are also set forth above. Claim 11 has been amended similarly to Claim 1 and so the reasons set forth above for the allowability of Claim 1 over Okamoto et al. and Nakaoka et al. apply as well to Claim 11, and so for all of the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that Claim 11 is allowable over Okamoto et al., Nakaoka et al. and in view of Loeffler et al., and, indeed, over all of the art of record whether considered individually or in any combination. Claims 12 - 15 depend from Claim 11 and so are allowable as well for the same


reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite the patentably distinguishing features of the invention and that, taken together with the above remarks, the present application is now in proper form for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of the claims are requested at an early date.

While it is believed that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees to the Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Dennis Moore
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 28,885

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: (972) 917-5646
Fax: (972) 917-4418